



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	10.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,022		08/07/2001	Bruce E. McNair	ATT-020PUS	3026
26652	7590	0 02/07/2006		EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP.			BEAMER, TEMICA M		
P.O. BOX 4110 MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2681	
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,					
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<del></del>		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/924,022	MCNAIR, BRUCE E.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Temica M. Beamer	2681				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	/ IS SET TO EVDIDE 2 MONTH/	S) OP THIRTY (30) DAYS				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  12 cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 No.	ovember 2005.					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)🖂	4) Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.						
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)∐	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* \$	see the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ea.				
Attachmen	i(s)	_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/924,022

Art Unit: 2681

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 28, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Stewart fails to disclose simulcast signals transmitted from base stations to a mobile station in order to determine the location of the mobile station. The examiner, however, disagrees. Stewart teaches a method of locating a mobile station by using TDOA (col. 5, lines 15-18). Stewart teaches that the mobile station observes the time difference of arrival in signals from multiple base stations to the mobile station (col. 5, lines 19-27). Inherently, the signals from the base stations have to be transmitted at the same time (simulcast) in order for the mobile to calculate the time difference of the arriving signals. Further, as stated in Stewart, the timing reference between the base stations should be known for effectively calculating TDOA (col. 5, lines 38-40).

Based on the above arguments, the rejection to the claims stands as set forth below.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-16 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stewart et al (Stewart), U.S. Patent No. 6,009,091.

Regarding claims 1-7, 10-16 and 18-27, Stewart discloses a method for locating a mobile station comprising receiving a plurality of simulcast signals from respective base stations; determining relative time of arrival information for the received plurality of simulcast signals and determining the position of the mobile station (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 27). Stewart further discloses OFDM modulation and the transmission of the base station ID in simulcast signals (col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 4, col. 7, lines 52-57).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart and well known prior art.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Stewart discloses the method according to claim 1 as described. Stewart, however, fails to specifically disclose the various techniques of locating a mobile station such as using GPS and Doppler Shift.

The examiner contends, however, that such techniques are very well known in the art and the examiner takes official notice as such. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stewart with such

Application/Control Number: 09/924,022

Art Unit: 2681

location determining mechanisms to perhaps improve the accuracy of locating a mobile station in an emergency situation.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Oren et al (Oren), U.S. Patent No. 6,725,045.

Regarding claim 17, Stewart the method of claim 15 as described above.

Stewart, however, fails to disclose broadcasting location-specific advertisements.

In a similar field endeavor, Oren discloses broadcasting location-specific advertisements (col. 4,lines 8-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Stewart with the teachings of Oren in order to notify mobile units of advertisements the mobile user may be interested in.

#### Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 09/924,022

Art Unit: 2681

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Temica M. Beamer whose telephone number is (571) 272-7797. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (alternate Fridays) 7:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Temica M. Beamer Primary Examiner Art Unit 2681

Jenisa M. Deamy

tmb